

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/031,556	10/19/2001	William Ernest Pullman	29342/36206A	6526	
4743	7590 09/01/2004		EXAMINER		
	L, GERSTEIN & BORUN	COOK, REBECCA			
6300 SEARS 1 233 S. WACK	= -		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
CHICAGO, I			1614		
			DATE MAILED: 09/01/2004	DATE MAILED: 09/01/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/031,556	PULLMAN ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rebecca Cook	1614	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 06 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avairal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicate) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper repl n places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 Circles	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejectine FINAL REJECTION.  R 1.136(a) and the apprunt of the fee. The approriginally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR)</li> </ol>			
<ol><li>The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be</li></ol>	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	s.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Section 1.		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	• • •		and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: none.			
Claim(s) objected to: none.			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>11-17 and 20-24</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.			
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·	
0. Other:		REBECCA COOK PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1200/6/	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' argument that final rejection should be withdrawn is not persuasive, since the statement regarding comparing the efficacy of the instant 20 mg of the compound of the instant mehtod with the 50 mg disclosed in Daugan is in response to the Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 submitted on January 15, 2004. The Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 of July 26, 2004 is not persuasive, since no unexpected results is seen comparing the instant 20 mg with the 50 mg of Daugan when the standard deviation data are considered. Furthermore, the Declaration of July 25, 2004 does not include SD data or the P value.